**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

# POSTMETHOD PEDAGOGY: ALLY OR FOE

## SEYYED ALI HOSSEINI[1], NASER RASHIDI[2], ALI REZA RASTI[3]

[1,2,3]Department of Foreign Language and Linguistics, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Fars, Iran

**SEYYED ALI HOSSEINI**

## ABSTRACT

As an alternative to the limitations and uncertainties inherit in the concept of method and method based pedagogy, the post method condition prioritizes learner investment and learner interest by giving learners a meaningful role in pedagogical decision making. Hence, it is at least, for the time being insightful and or promising in that it introduces 'awareness' in to the realm of ESL/EFL learning and teaching. Being backed by the principles of critical pedagogy, postmethod pedagogy links to social justice and social transformation through education. By viewing education as an intrinsically political, power-related activity, followers of critical pedagogy intend to scrutinise its discriminatory foundations and take steps toward reforming it to include left out ethnical, and social groups. Postmethod's wider recognition of context and its critical dimension compared to the communicative language teaching approach, allows including aspects of the real socio-political lives of the people involved in the learning process. Besides these, however, the theory leaves out some equally important issues. The present critical paper was therefore written in an attempt to see whether postmethod pedagogy fully captures the notions of initiative and voice and criticise postmethod pedagogy with regard to the notions of dominance and power. The authors conclude that postmethod pedagogy with its emphasis on particularity and the lessening of the influences of power and dominance fails to fully capture the notion of initiative in agency and hence offers little about the means by which this objective could be achieved in EFL contexts. Moreover, the approach is in a desperate need of directing its attention more to the concept of voice. It needs to give an ear to the voices of teachers and learners in less unexplored EFL pedagogical contexts in order come up with better solutions to existing and potential future problems. Finally, Understanding that inequality/gate keeping is a factor that often keeps the human societies running smoothly, postmethod pedagogy does not clearly say how it is possible to include the neglected and avoid chias at the same time.

**Key words:** Postmethod Pedagogy, Agency, Initiative, Voice, Power, Autonomy, Language

**INTRODUCTION**

Lately we have witnessed the steady mounting of critical thoughts on the nature and scope of method.Not only have language teaching practitioners been warned against the blind acceptance of unapproved methods but also they have been advised to approach the very concept of 'method' with forethought and precaution (Allwright, 1991; Pennycook, 1989; Prabhu, 1990; and Stern, 1983, 1985, 1992). Hardly new, the uneasiness about the concept of method can be traced back to the fact that methods have long been motivated and maintained by multiple myths which in turn have created an inflated imageof them and contributed to a gradual erosion of their usability as a construct in language teaching and learning (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a). Addressing six underlying reasons for the relative unhelpfulness of the concept of method, Allwright (1991) introduces the imaginary of 'death of method'. Interestingly, the reasons presented by him are for the most part teacher related and easily accord with the myths of method. Allwright (1991) asserts that the concept of method may hinder the development of a 'valuable, internally-derived sense of coherence'; a fact which has been fully discussed by Clarke (2003). Likely, Brown, 2002; Jarvis, 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 1992, 1994, 2001, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2006a, 2006b; Mackey, 1965, Nunan, 1989; Pennycook, 1989; and Stern, 1992,although differing in terminology, voice  the death of method. In an attempt to shift away from the concept of method and avoid the uncertainties attached to it, teachers often resort to constructing a principled eclectic approach and therefore often find themselves in an unenviable position where they have to straddle two pedagogical worlds: a method based one that is imposed on them and a methodological one which is improvised by them (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p.170)'. For various reasons, some of which have been addressed here; the theoretical validity and practical utility of the concept of method and method based pedagogy have been questioned (Canagarajah, 1999; Johnson, 2003; Pennycook, 1998; Philipson, 1992; Prabhu, 1990; Recinto, 2000). However, Kumaravadivelu's (2001) critical stance and the ELT pedagogical model based on them (Known as postmethod pedagogy) has received extra credit. Rooted in post modernism, the model is a three-dimensional system which comprises of the parameters of particularity, practicality and possibility (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Later, Kumaravadivelu coupled the parameters with ten macrostrategies and presented the so called 'pedagogical wheel' (2003a). Here, 'pedagogy' has been broadened to cover different areas of  L2 education as well as issues relating to classroom strategies, instructional materials, curricular objectives, evaluation measures, and a wide range of historical, political, and sociocultural experiences that directly influence l2 education (Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Broadly speaking, postmethod pedagogy approaches L2 education from the pedagogical and ideological perspectives (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a). This should not however, fool us in to the mistaken belief that the two concepts are mutually exclusive. Pedagogy in its true sense; one which includes sociocultural, political, and economical aspects necessitates the spontaneous study of the two concepts (Auerbach, 1993; Fairclough, 1995, 2010; Tollefson, 2002).

In Kumaravadivelu's (2006a) terms: pedagogy is ''context-sensitive''. In that attempts are made to bring about awareness and in that way 'fundamentally reconstruct our view of language teaching and learning' (p. 170). According to him, all those involved in a L2 educational system should make informed decisions which are sensitive to and at the same time include current issues of a specific given context. This sensitivity becomes even more of prominence in the light of imperialist and capitalist ideological influences, exercised through the 'predominantly generation of contest rather than coercion' (Fairclough 2010, p. 531).

To stage a fair argument, the first part of this article rounds ona definition of postmethod pedagogy and addresses some of its philosophical foundations. The second part presents some critics on it. Finally, agency is defined and postmethod pedagogy is discussed with respect to initiative, voice, and the notions of power and dominance.

**Postmethod Pedagogy**

As an alternative to the limitations and uncertainties inherit in the concept of method and method based pedagogy, the post method condition as a 'sustainable state of affairs compels us to fundamentally restructure our view of language teaching and teacher education. It demands that we seriously contemplate the essentials of coherent post method pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p. 170). This unique condition has

set the scene for scholars to detach themselves from the problems arising from the limitations of method and hypothesize, theorize and seek alternatives to better L2 teaching and learning. As mentioned elsewhere, the postmethod pedagogical model presented by Kumaravadivelu (2006a) is more insightful than others in that it integrates a number of parameters and indicators with a set of macro and micro strategies which 'constitute the operating principles for constructing a situation-specific postmethod pedagogy'(Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p. 208).In brief, the parameters of the postmethod pedagogy introduced by Kumaravadivelu (2001) constitute the systematic organizing elements of his suggested pedagogy and the macro and micro strategies constitute the guidelines for the operationalization of the parameters. Moreover, postmethod pedagogy consists of indicators which are understood as the functions and features that reflect the role played by key participants in L2 learning and teaching operations governing postmethod pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2001).With respect to the prominence attached to the role of parameters in postmethod pedagogy, the following sections discuss them briefly.

Particularity is the most significant aspect of postmethod pedagogy. That is to say, 'any post method pedagogy must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching in a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural milieu (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 538).In this sense, postmethod pedagogy rejects the very notion of 'one size fits all' underlying method-based pedagogies. Lying at the heart of the idea of pedagogical particularity is the fact that meaningful pedagogy is senseless without a holistic interpretation of particular situations and that its improvement requires at least a general improvement of those particular situations (Elliot, 1993). According to the particularity parameter, pedagogies that overlook local needs and lived experiences arouse hostility and thus hinder learning (Colman, 1996). Hence, it seems as if we are left with no other option rather than practicing particularity and hoping that a context-sensitive education will emerge as a result. To the end, policymakers and program administrators need to become critically aware of local conditions of teaching and learning and seriously consider them in putting together an effective teaching program. This in turn, 'involves practicing teachers, either individually or collaboratively observing their teaching acts, evaluating their outcomes, identifying problems, finding solutions, and trying them out to see once again what works and what doesn't' (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p.172). Put otherwise, any attempt to understand the parameter of particularity without understanding the parameter of practicality is misleading and at times superficial. In this sense, the parameter of particularity merges in to the parameter of practicality.

On the one hand the parameter of practicality relates to the relationship between theory and practice. On the other hand it accounts for the teacher's skill in monitoring their teaching effectiveness. In specific terms, teachers are not the sheer consumer of theories but contrarily, ought to be given the right so as to theorize what they practice and practice what they theorize (Kumaravadivelu, 2001).Also, it echoes the voice of those who object to the so called top-down transmission of knowledge particularly from the developed world to the undeveloped or developing word. It runs counter to the idea(s) of injecting educational principles and or ideologies to those societies; stressing the role of particularity in its own right (Fairclough, 1995/2010; Hodge & Kress, 1993; van Dijk, 1993a, 1993b).Teachers have repeatedly been warned against the danger of the theory vs. practice dichotomy and the distinction between professional and personal theories (O'Hanlon, 1993) that in part have influenced action research. The parameter of practicality goes well beyond the deficiencies inherit in such dichotomies and gives more room to self-conceptualization and self-construction of pedagogic knowledge on the part of the teacher (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a).However, teachers should not be let alone, they need to be assisted to develop the required knowledge, skill, attitude, and autonomy to construct their own context-sensitive theory of practice. They must be helped to reach in Van Manen's (1991) terms 'pedagogical thoughtfulness' or as Freeman (1998) puts it engage in 'inquiry-oriented teacher research'. The parameter of practicality then includes teacher's reflection and action, which are in turn based on their insights and intuitions. Through their day-to-day encounter with teaching pressures, institutional constrains, learner expectations, assessment instruments, and a variety of other factors, teachers collect an unexplained and sometime unexplainable awareness of what constitutes good teaching; the very fact that goes by different terms; for some it is a 'sense of plausibility' (Prabhu, 1990), for others it is 'the

ethnic of practicality' (Hargreaves, 1994) or simply 'sense making' (Van Manen, 1977). 'This seemingly indistinctive and idiosyncratic nature of the teachers sense making disguises the fact that it is formed and re-formed by pedagogical factors governing the microcosm of the classroom as well as by the larger socio-political forces emending from the outside' (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p.174). In this way, the parameter of practicality connects with the parameter of possibility.

According to Kumaravadivelu (2006a) 'the parameter of possibility owes much of its origin to Freire (1984) and his followers' (p.174) who claimed that pedagogy is valueladen and includes elements of power and dominance. It is aimed at creating and sustaining social inequalities (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a).They advocate for acknowledging and highlighting students and teachers individual identities. 'The need to develop theories, forms of knowledge, and social practices that work within the experiences people bring to the pedagogical setting' are also emphasised (Giroux, 1988, p.134). It is believed that the experiences participants bring to the pedagogical setting are shaped by the classroom life, as well as by a broader social, economic, and political environment in which they live. With respect to the aforementioned discussions teachers need to vary against ignoring the sociocultural reality that influences identity formation and separating the learners' linguistic needs from their social needs (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a).

In this section, the parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility as the building blocks of postmethod pedagogy have been briefly addressed. Besides, the functions and features that are considered to reflect the role played by key participants in the L2 learning and teaching operations are of prominence. It is these pedagogic indicators to which we now turn.

## Postmethod pedagogy revisited

Postmethod pedagogy prioritizes learner investment and learner interest by giving learners a meaningful role in pedagogical decision making. In this sense 'learning to learn' and 'learning to liberate' are necessary elements of what Kumaravadivelu (2003a) terms learner autonomy in its narrow and broad sense, respectively. Learners are supposed to take charge of and become responsible for their own learning. Taken together the two types of autonomy coupled with the concept of agency (Van Lier,2008)are directed in such a way to bring about the development of overall ability, social consciousness, and the necessary needed mental attitudes for students to overcome difficulties in and outside the classroom. In line with the notion of learner autonomy, teacher autonomy has been emphasised to the extent that it is now considered as the 'defining heart' of postmethod pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2006a, p.178). Teachers are expected to act autonomously within the academic and administrative constraints on the part of institutions, curricula, and textbooks. In accord with the underlying assumptions of sociocultural theory, postmethod pedagogy assigns the role of a learner to teachers. Here, it is assumed that teachers develop both individually and professionally in the course of teaching. A fact which goes smoothly well with, the concept of mediation, according to which teachers simultaneously, mediate and are mediated by the learners.

In light of the above discussions it is evident that postmethod pedagogy is at least, for the time being insightful and or promising in that it introduces 'awareness' in to language learning and teaching.Being backed by the principles of critical pedagogy, postmethod pedagogy links to social justice and social transformation through education. 'By viewing education as an intrinsically political, power-related activity, followers of critical pedagogy intend to scrutinise its discriminatory foundations and take steps toward reforming it to include left out ethnical, social, and etc. groups (Giroux, 1983). Postmethod's wider recognition of context and its critical dimension compared to the communicative language teaching approach, allows including aspects of the real socio-political lives of the people involved in the learning process (Akbari, 2008). Besides that, however, the theory leaves out some equally important issues. Akbari (2008) argues that while respecting the inclusiveness and empowerment present in postmethod pedagogy as a positive turn of events, we must understand 'that by trying to include more of the realities of learners and learning context in its formulation, the postmethod discourse has lost sight of the reality of teaching and teachers' lives and has made the implementation of pedagogy of practicality problematic, if not impossible' (Akbari, 2008, p.666). Taking his lead, Shakouri (2012) draws our attention to the fact that teachers' theories which most often originate from their practice(s) are not only often taken for granted but the teacher's scope of abilities and authority in

**SEYYED ALI HOSSEINI et al.,**

decision making are normally not even questioned. However, he asserts that claiming that teachers possess the total freedom and required ability to employ their personal blend in the class seems a farfetched dream since other internal and external factors affect their decision making.

Postmethod pedagogy criticises those methods and pedagogies in that local features of particular situations have been ignored in the expense of putting irrational and ideology oriented emphasis on global features of L2 education(Kabgani & Zaferani, 2013).They beg for the insertion of local processes and practices in to language teaching and learning. A question often left unanswered however is that 'whether the shift of stress from globally-oriented ideologies to local processes and practices of a given pedagogy solve the problems attributed to them?' It's been argued that the 'exclusive and excessive emphasis put on the locality of L2 pedagogies has presented an incomplete picture of L2 education'. In a sense that' the two sides of the social dimension that can be divided between the local and global aspects of pedagogy have been presented defectively to the cost of ignoring global issues of L2 pedagogy' (Kabgani & Zaferani, 2013, p.434). In the same place, once presenting an overview on the relation between representational technology, identity and postmethod pedagogy; the authors conclude that postmethod pedagogy as presented by Kumaravadivelu fails to give direct reference to discursive and ideological structures of ELT materials (ibid).

**Postmethod Pedagogy, Initiative, Voice, Dominance, Power**

The main principle involved in the notion of agency is that 'language learning depends on the activity and initiation of the learner, more than any input transmitted to the learner from the teacher and textbook' (Van Lier, in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008, p.163). This does not obviously eliminate the need for textbooks and teachers. It merely shifts the stress from them to action, interaction, and affordances (Van Lier, in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008). In this sense, a mediating role is assigned to the teachers and textbooks in the presence of action, interaction and affordances. Simply defined, agency is 'the socioculturally mediated capacity to act' (Ahearn, 2001, 112). This definition raises questions about the kinds of sociocultural mediation involved or what is meant by sociocultural mediation. Taking another perspective, Duranti (2004) presents a operational definition of agency which contains three basic elements of '(1) control over one's behaviour; (2) producing actions that affect other entities as well as self; and (3) producing actions that are object of evaluation' (Van Lier, in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008, p.163). Compared to Ahearn's (2001) definition, this working definition, despite being more detailed does not explain the notion of sociocultural meditation.

Contrary to the Western theories of agency which assume it as a property of the individual; taking Vygotsky's lead, sociocultural theories argue that agency is a contextually enacted way of being in the world' (Wretsch, Tulviste and Hagstrom, 1993). Put otherwise, it is both 'intermental' and 'intramental' (ibid: 337). It then appears as if agency is always a social event that never occurs in a vacuum. 'Even when an unsolicited individual act is agentive, it is socially interpreted' (Van Lier, in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008, p.163). 'Agency surpasses voluntarily control over one's behaviour and entails the ability to assign relevance and significance to things and events' (Lantolf and Thome, 2006, p.143). The same authors assert that agency can be exercised both by individuals and groups, allowing them to speak from an 'I' as well as a 'we' perspective (Ibid).

As stated elsewhere, agency is context specific and is not something that learners possess. In fact, it is something that they do. More specifically, it is behaviour rather than property (Van Lier, in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008).Agency can be related to such factors as violation, intentionality, initiative, intrinsic motivation and autonomy (ibid). In order to put the construct of agency on a more solid footing, Van Leir, (in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008) suggests what he calls three core features of agency. According to him (1) agency involves initiative or self-regulation; (2) is interdependent; and (3) includes awareness of the responsibility of one's actions. With this in mind, it is time to turn to some central classroom issues that relate to agency and advocate for, and or argue against their benefits and merits in the light of postmethod pedagogy and the notions of language, power and dominance.

**Language and power**

Understanding that the notion of power is inseparable from language necessitates, at least, a brief discussion of the topic. Hence, the following lines briefly discuss the notion of power and its relation to language. As an influential figure in the realm, Fairclough (1989), asserts that' sociolinguistic conventions have

a dual relation to power: on the one hand they incorporate differences of power, on the other hand they arise out of-and give raise to-particular relations of power' (Fairclough, 1989, p.2).  In the same place, particular emphasis is put on ''common-sense' assumptions which are implicitin the conventions according to which people interact linguistically, and of which people are generally not consciously aware' (ibid).As an example take the conventions for a traditional typeof consultation between doctors and patients and how they embody 'commonsense 'assumptions which treat authority and hierarchy as natural (ibid). An important point here is that it is possible to find assumptions of this sort embedded in the forms of language that are used (Fairclough, 1989, p.2). The same applies to EFL and ESL pedagogical settings in which the teacher knows about teaching and the learner doesn't; the teacher is in a position to determine how a teaching/learning problem should be dealt with and the learner isn't; it is right (and 'natural') that the teacher should make the decisions and control the course of the consultation and of the teaching/learning, and that the learner should obey and cooperate; and so on. Fairclough terms such assumptions as ideologies. He is quick to point out that ideologies are closely linked to power, 'because the nature of the ideological assumptions embedded in particular conventions, and so the nature of those conventions themselves, depends on the power relations which underlie the conventions; and because they are a means of legitimizing existing social relations and differences of power, simply through the recurrence of ordinary, familiar ways of behaving which take these relations and power differences for granted' (1989, p.2).

Equally important is the link between power relations, class relations and social struggle where 'the maximization of the profits and power of one class [group] depends upon the maximization of its exploitation and domination of another' (Fairclough, 1989, p.35).Regardless of degrees of intensity or forms of appearance, all social developments, and any exercise of power, take place under conditions of social struggle. This applies equally well to language as both as it off and a stake in class struggle. In this sense, all those who exercise power through language must constantly be involved in struggle with others to defend (orlose) their position.

With respect to the previously stated assertions, the notions of initiative and voice and the underlying assumptions of postmethod pedagogy; the point that needs to be addressed is the extent to which postmethod pedagogy has succeeded in developing learner initiative and taking account of the notion of voice. It will be argued that given the existing power relations, ideologies, and 'sociolinguistic conventions in conventional EFL/ESL pedagogical settings it is very demanding, if not impossible to appropriately practice the tenets of postmethod pedagogy.

**Problematizing postmethod pedagogy**

The origins of the idea of initiative can be traced backed to responsive teaching (Bowers and Flinders, 1990), autonomy-supported behaviour (Deci, 1995), and handover/takeover in scaffolding (Van Lier, 2004). Learners are said to be initiative when they have a choice about who says what, to whom, and when (Stevick, 1980). A misassumption here is that learners' initiative conflicts with a teachers control in the classroom. In practical terms however, a teachers control in fact enhances the possibilities for initiative to emerge.With respect to the parameter of particularity in postmethod pedagogy, issues of language and power (Fairclough, 1989), and in line with the assumption that powerful participants control and constrain the contributions of non-powerful participants (Fairclough, 1985); the question that remains to be answered is that whether the role of learner initiative has been fully captured by postmethod pedagogy or not? Put more simply, do the issues of power and dominance give room to initiative in the Iranian EFL conventional classes? In a sociocultural framework, from which postmethod pedagogy borrows most of its assumptions, the influence of power and dominance are stressed and mention is made of the fact that their impacts differ from context to context, situation to situation. People often assume that the development of initiative seems more probable in pedagogical ESL settings which welcome/respect individual diversity, understand the role of learners as constructors of their own meaning, and advocate and strive for developing autonomy in the learners; compared to more conventional EFL settings. Although this may be true in some situations, in many cases, however, these pedagogical settings may be nothing more than big claims which are only promising at the very surface. This makes us understand that more or less, the notions of dominance and powers are present in every single pedagogical activity (in this case language teaching and learning) and as well as other things, affect

what learners say to who, why, and when. For instance, take Iranian conventional EFL teachers, who are deeply attached to their past teaching and learning experiences in which constrains are set on what Fairclough distinguishes as 'contents', relations, and subjects (1989). In these contexts, the teachers try to establish themselves by personally deciding on the overall teaching, learning and assessment procedures and student involvement/initiative is often equal to challenging the teacher's authority and an indicator of unruly behaviour. Put otherwise, leaners are obliged to avoid negative consequences at all costs by readily accepting what the teacher says and giving up to the demands of the pedagogical setting by what is called respecting the teacher's authority and knowledge; the very fact that runs contrary to the assumptions of postmethod pedagogy, initiative and agency. Moreover, eliminating readily established ways of doing something is even harder and requires accelerated effort and excessive resources which are more than often missing in most Iranian pedagogical settings. Learners and  teachers who have been trained and educated in the former dominant language teaching/learning theories are less than willing to leave their comfort zones and invest themselves in postmethod pedagogy. In the same way, educational authorities, especially in more closed social, cultural, political and educational systems fear the potential changes brought about by initiative learners and therefore deliberately or undeliberately form guarding attitudes towards the notion of agency and agentive learners. In light of the above discussions, it is apparent that postmethod pedagogy has often failed to draw the attention of learners, teachers and authorities. Although some people reject this point and claim that more and more teachers and authorities are calling for the practice of postmethod pedagogy; in reality, however, we are confronted with teachers and authorities who literally pay lip service to the assumptions of postmethod pedagogy as a way of avoiding criticism and appearing smart or knowledgeable. Likely, learners use the notions of initiative and postmethod pedagogy in cases where they are endangered by the teacher or educational authorities. For instance, having confronted a tough test, learners may call for their initiative and agentive role while they are less than willing to invest in it. Now, let's put these aside for a moment and assume that such a pedagogical setting truly exists in which the learners freely decide on what to say, to whom and when; is it possible to claim that they are initiative? Probably not, since the notions of power and dominance are inherit in almost all instructional material as well as assessment tools. Agency in general and initiative in particular, require the voice of the learners to be heard. This means revision in educational planning, curriculum development, syllabus design, assessment tools and teacher education; all of which are firmly rooted in tradition, beliefs, custom etc. and present readily established educational and non-educational values. In practice, the postmethod pedagogy with its emphasis on particularity and the lessening of the influences of power and dominance fails to fully capture the notion of initiative and hence offers little about the means by which this objective could be achieved in the Iranian EFL context.

Agency also includes voice. In Bakhtin's (1982) sense of the word voice 'refers to infusing one's words with one's feeling, thoughts, and identity, that is investing one's self in one's words' (Van Leir in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008, p.178). This will not happen unless a close connection exists between the word, the self, and its emerging identity. Hence, there should be a strong tie between the word and person. Here, the notion of person is broadened to include action, emotion, mind, body and purpose (Van Leir in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008). If the conditions are met, the learner would comment that she/he said something because she/he wanted to say so. Said otherwise, the learner decides to speak not because 'someone asked them to (re)produce, repeat, display or manufacture a linguistic piece for the sake of demonstrating proficiency'(Van Leir in Lantolf & Poehner, 2008, p.178), the very fact that is problematic with respect to conventional pedagogy. In a traditional sense, which is often the case in non-western settings and developing countries, language classes carry the need for displaying one's language knowledge or proficiency. There is a preference among teachers, learners, stakeholders, as well as school and educational authorities to see something actually happening on the scene. This something often manifests it's self in the form of some sort of production and is considered as an indicator that learning is actually taking place; which may not actually be the case at all. Learners are more than often required to repeat, reproduce or display a linguistic piece in order to avoid being labeled 'bad learners' and receive poor marks. With this in mind, it is very demanding to convince teachers and even learners to respect their role as an individual unique teacher and learner and allow for an investment of the

self in language learning/teaching. Put more simply, it is very challenging, though not impossible to draw the attention of the teachers, particularly those who are working in low paid conditions and are pressed against the demands of the educational and wider social, cultural and political systems to the fact that students have a voice (in Bakhtin's (1982) sense of the word) which should be understood and valued. Likely, it is very demanding to equip the learners; the majority of whom enroll in language classes to fulfill the requirements of a course/degree with the necessary skills to adapt an agentive role and take responsibility for their learning. Postmethod pedagogy then is in a desperate need of directing its attention more to the concept of voice. It needs to give an ear to the voices of teachers and learners in less unexplored EFL pedagogical contexts in order come up with better solutions to existing and potential future problems.

Another argument which can be staged against postmethod pedagogy and critical pedagogy from which postmethod pedagogy borrows some of its tenants is that knowledge, in this case language has a gate keeping function too (Fairclough, 1989). It may be the case that in some situations knowledge has been deliberatelyshapedand intentionally used to create injustice and in that way prevent somefrom entering a certain context or favouring from a specific condition (Fairclough, 1989), the very fact that runs counter to the tenants of postmethod pedagogy. According to the assumptions of which, we should expose its discriminatory foundations and take steps toward reforming it to include people who have been excluded because of their gender, race, social class and etc. (Karimi, 2008).  However, drawing on the notions of dominance and power,it is neither always probable nor desirable to follow this line of thought. Understanding that inequality is a factor that often keeps the human societies running smoothly, postmethod pedagogy does not clearly say how it is possible to follow this stream of thought and avoid chias at the same time.

## Conclusion

Postmethod pedagogy as an alternative to the concept of method is insightful and promising in providing better opportunities and bringing awareness in to the realm of language teaching and learning. It explains language learning within the framework of parameters and indicators and ties them to macro and micro strategies. It respects the role of teachers and learner as constructors of personal meaning and accounts for autonomy, agency and mediated learning. Despite its benefits however, the hefty emphasis postmethod pedagogy puts on learning and the learner is problematic in that it requires too much of the teachers and learners which has at times resulted false expectations and far reached fantasies. Teachers who are pressed against the professional and wider social, cultural, economic, and political strains; and are striving for professional establishment and social development, hardly, if ever have time to think or act according to the assumptions of postmethod pedagogy. Learners are not in a better condition. Postmethod pedagogy requires learners to develop autonomy and attain an agentive role. With regard to previously stated assertions, it is very difficult to assign an agentive role to the learners; especially in those EFL conventional settings in which both the teachers and learners are obliged to avoid negative consequences at all costs. In these situations concepts such as initiative, voice, and identity gave way to more traditional assumptions of what constitutes learning. With respect to the practicality parameter and the notions of dominance and power, it is not quite clear how postmethod pedagogy advocates for their reduction while understanding the gate-keeping function of language and the very nature of knowledge, in this case language which may have been created to cause injustice as an undeniable factors which keeps human societies running smoothly.In light of various stressed and unstressed facts, postmethod pedagogy needs to broaden its scope to include some of the less addressed factors and overcome potential difficulties.

## REFERENCES

Ahearn, L.M. (2001). Language and agency.  Annual Review of Anthropology. Vol.30, issue 1: pp. 109-137.

Akbari, R. (2008). Post-method Discourse and Practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(4), 641–52

Allwright, R. L. (1991). The death of the method (Working Paper No. 10). Lancaster, England: The University of Lancaster, the Exploratory Practice Centre.

Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. TESOL Quarterly,27(1),9-32.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1982). The dialogic imagination, trans. C.Emerson and Holquist, Austin: University of Texas press.

**SEYYED ALI HOSSEINI et al.,**

Clarke, M. A. (2003). A place to stand. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Coleman, H. (1996). Autonomy and Ideology in the English language classroom. In H. Coleman (Ed.) *society and the language classroom* (pp. 54-60). Cambridge, England: Cambridge university press.

Duranti, A. (2004). A companion to linguistic anthropology. Maiden, Mass: Blackwell.

Elliott, J. Reconstructing teacher education. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Fairclough, N. (1995/2010). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London: Longman.

_____., (2006). Language and Globalization. Routledge: London, UK.

Freeman, D. (1998). Doing teacher research. Boston, MA: Hienle & Hienle.

Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education: culture, power, and liberation. (D. Macedo, Trans.). South Hadley,MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H.A. (1983). Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy of the opposition. Bergin & Garvey,Inc. South Hadley, MA.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers: changing times. New York: Teachers college press.

Kabgani, S. &Zaferani, P. (2013). A Critical Review of Postmethod Pedagogy. The Iranian foreign language journal. pp. 427-447.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1992). Macrostrategies for the second/foreign language teacher. *Modern Language Journal,* 76(1), 41–49.

_____., (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/ foreign language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 27–48.

_____., (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 35, 537–560.

_____., (2002). Method, antimethod, postmethod. In A. Pulverness (Ed.), IATEFL 2002 York Conference selections. Kent, England: IATEFL.

_____., (2003a). Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching. New Haven, CT: YaleUniversity Press.

_____., (2003b). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. World Englishes, 22,539–550.

_____., (2006a). Understanding language teaching: from method to postmethod. Mahwah, NJ:Erlbaum.

_____., (2006b). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. TESOL Quarterly, 40(1),59-81.

Lantolf, j., & Throne, S.L. (2006). Sociocultural theory and the Genesis of second language development. New York: oxford university press.

Mackey, W. F. (1965). Language teaching analysis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing tasks for the communicative classroom. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

O'Hanlon, C. (1993). The importance of an articulated personal theory of professional development. In J.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 23, 589–618.

_____., (1998). English and the discourses of colonialism. London: Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method why? TESOL Quarterly, 24, 161–176. Piaget, J. (1954). The Construction of Reality in the Child, New York: Basic Books.

Ricento, T. (Ed.) (2000). Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English. Amsterdam: JohnBenjamins.

Shakouri, N. 2012. Methods Are Not Dead. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture* (JCLC).Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 7-12.

Stevich, E.W. (1980). A way and ways. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc. p. 297.

Stern, H. H. (1992). Issues and options in language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993b). Principles of experience into social science: Critical discourse analysis. Discourse Feminism and Psychology, 1(1), 155-69.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993c). Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse and Society 4(2), 249-83.

Van Lier, L. (1996). Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity. NewYork: Longman.

_____., (2004). The Ecology and Semiotics of Language Learning. A sociocultural perspective. Boston: Kluwer Academic.

_____., (2008). Agency in the classroom. Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second languages, 163, 186.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. Curriculum inquiry, 6, 205-228.

_____.,(1991). The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness. Allbany: State University of New York press.

Wretsch, J.V., Tulviste, P., and Hagstrom, F. (1993). A sociocultural approach to agency. In E.A.Forman, N.Minick & C.A.Stone (Eds.), contexts for learning: sociocultural dynamics in children's development. Oxford: OUP.